

I can remember walking there through the talk radio, through all the talk show hosts who were located on the White House grounds, at President Clinton's invitation, giving their commentary on American politics, and this President's performance. When the President thought that he could bring these people to his side and swing opinion in his direction, he lobbied the talk show hosts. He thought they were great people. However, they listened to people, and most Americans are fairly conservative. Apparently, he has not appreciated the heat that he has taken from these people.

In a couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker, we are going to celebrate and commemorate the Americans who lost their lives in battles in this country and outside of this country, from Bunker Hill to Belleau Wood to Inchon in Korea, to Khe Sanh, to the Persian Gulf, and those Americans who lost their lives fought, of course, for that broad array of freedoms that we generally describe as liberty in this great land. One of those greatest freedoms is the right to criticize your elected officials.

Therefore, Mr. President, when you listen to talk show hosts and you do not like to the fact that they are criticizing you or taking you on, do not worry. Do not complain. It is the sound of freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICANS WANT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET ON THE BACKS OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we are facing up to a very important decision, albeit late, and that is the budget for the people of the United States of America. I stand here this evening because a couple of weeks ago the State Comptroller for the State of Texas announced that through the rescission cuts, the State of Texas and its people will lose \$1.5 billion.

Yet, now, we have a budget proposal that takes those dollars on the backs of Texans and eliminates some 283 pro-

grams, as proposed by Republicans, and agrees to give the full measure of tax cuts already denied and rejected by the Senate Committee and the Budget chairman, Senator DOMENICI. This is the tax cut that will give those individuals making \$30,000 or less a mere \$124 a year, and the tax cut that gives the real working Americans, along with those Americans making \$30,000 or less, some \$760; that is, those making between \$30,000 and \$75,000.

In the course of this budget proposal, which is focused particularly on the backs of young people, on teachers, on students, and on the elderly, we first come full force to cut the Department of Energy, at the same time that the Secretary of Energy is reforming and reinventing her own department.

Here, now, we are a country which indicates a great interest in technological discoveries, a great need for a renewed energy policy, and many of the environmental efforts that have been made by the Department of Energy. Now we want to eliminate that department, just as we are addressing the focus of that department, which is to develop a real domestic energy policy, one that will address the needs of business, create jobs, and yes, open up opportunities internationally.

That department has been targeted for elimination, not improvement, not downsizing, but elimination, so I guess we will throw technology to the winds, the environment to the winds, and certainly, we will throw the opportunities for bringing the energy industry to the table to discuss important issues of developing a domestic energy policy that many could agree with, we will throw that to the winds, too, by eliminating the department.

The Department of Commerce, which over the last couple of years has generated more business for Americans than any other department, rather than downsizing and effectively making it work for the American people, this budget proposal targeting the backs of Americans wants to eliminate the Department of Commerce.

We go further. Many of us have had the opportunity, particularly in the city of Houston, to see the Americorps students working, the domestic Peace Corps. We have seen them working to help communities, but as much as them working to help communities, we have seen them build opportunities for themselves by providing for themselves to go to college.

What are we trying to do with this new budget proposed by the Republicans? Shut down departments that are effective and working, rather than creating opportunities for downsizing, and over a measured period of time bringing down the deficit, as all of us could agree with, now we are attacking Americorps and totally eliminating it, a program that has gone into the trenches of America and worked with communities to improve housing, to clean up neighborhoods, to work with

underprivileged children, to work with seniors, to build buildings, if you will, and to help those particular areas to cut down on their costs. We are eliminating it.

Then we are so generous-spirited and generous-hearted, along with the \$280 billion cut from Medicare, which our seniors have vigorously indicated "What more do you want from us," we now want to cut from the Republican budget now being discussed, as we speak, housing for the elderly; individuals who have worked all their lives, but possibly worked in jobs that would not allow them to have the kinds of savings that you need, and they are provided for in these group retirement homes that are assisted by our housing authorities throughout this country. Yet, we wish to cut that. No alternatives could be offered, other than to cut housing for the elderly, along with Medicare.

The State Bar of Texas, which I have had the great pride of serving as a member of the legal profession on the board of directors on that organization, comprised of law firms and sole practitioners and attorneys who understand what it is to serve the public, they pleaded in my office for us to preserve the Legal Services Corporation; not a group that goes out and instigates litigations, as would be accused by Republicans who are apparently cutting it out, but those who would help individuals who do not have the ability to secure their own lawyers; the Legal Services Corporation, helping mothers get child support payments, working with the elderly, working with those legal immigrants who come in and need services. Yet, they are totally cutting out Legal Services.

We do not have a budget, we have a joke. We have something that is going to hurt the citizens of Texas, hurt the citizens of Houston. We need to get down to the business of working for America. Mr. Speaker, we need a real budget to work for Americans.

□ 2215

THE FLAT TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on an important issue. Now that the House has completed work on the Contract with America is a good time to begin looking past the first 100 days to future legislative goals.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a flat tax is in America's future. It is an idea which is catching fire across the Nation. What is it about the flat tax that Americans find so attractive? I believe the answer can be summarized in three words: trust, simplicity, and fairness.